



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,942	10/01/2004	Mi-Sun Sung	MUHAN1.001APC	7555

20995 7590 07/02/2009  
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
----------

ZIEGLE, STEPHANIE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3692

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/508,942	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUNG, MI-SUN	
	<b>Examiner</b> STEPHANIE ZIEGLE	<b>Art Unit</b> 3692	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephanie Ziegler. (3) Donald Min.

(2) Jennifer Liversedge. (4) Mincheol Kim.

Date of Interview: 29 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 18-42.

Identification of prior art discussed: Walker, Loeb, Blinn, and Macklin.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Examiner discussed how they read the prior art and how the prior art potentially differs from the claims of the instant invention. Claim language interpretation was also discussed. Applicant stated that they intend to file a 1.31 affidavit to disqualify Macklin as prior art. Examiner will review the attorney's filed official response to the office action, and respond accordingly in view of the discussion made during the interview.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Stephanie Ziegler/ Examiner, Art Unit 3692	/Jennifer Liversedge/ Examiner, Art Unit 3692
--	--